



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,672	04/16/2004	Richard F. Gladney	SMCY-P02-085	9591

7590 12/29/2004
ROPES & GRAY LLP
EDWARD J. KELLY
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER

SANTOS, ROBERT G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3673

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,672

Applicant(s)

GLADNEY, RICHARD F.

Examiner

Robert G. Santos

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/16/2004, 7/12/2004 and on 8/26/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07122004, 08262004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the first line of claim 6, "headboard," should be changed to --headboard--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles '729 in view of G.B. Pat. No. 2172198 to Poole. As concerns claims 1-3 and 8-10, Broyles '729 lacks the use of a mattress foundation (C) having at least one sidewall outer surface (2-5) with a pattern thereon which is substantially planar or three-dimensional, as well as the use of at least one ground support member (f) which also includes a pattern. Poole '198 provides the basic teaching of a plurality of frame units (10, 20, 30, 40) each including a pattern (54, 56, 59) attached thereto, wherein the patterns "may be colored plastic or wood, or have relief motifs or designs on them, or could be of upholstered design" (as described in page 2, lines 6-9). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the mattress assembly of Broyles '729 with a mattress foundation comprising at least one sidewall

Art Unit: 3673

outer surface and at least one ground support member each having a pattern in order to impart a finished appearance to the mattress assembly as desired.

With regards to claim 7, Broyles '729 is considered to show a condition wherein a pattern (12) is formed on at least a portion of the upper side of the top surface (1) of the mattress foundation (C) in Figure 1 and in column 2, lines 58-62.

4. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Propst '952 in view of Poole '198. Propst '952 lacks the use of a mattress foundation (C) having at least one sidewall outer surface (7) with a pattern thereon which is substantially planar or three-dimensional, as well as the use of at least one ground support member (W) which also includes a pattern. Poole '198 provides the basic teaching of a plurality of frame units (10, 20, 30, 40) each including a pattern (54, 56, 59) attached thereto, wherein the patterns "may be colored plastic or wood, or have relief motifs or designs on them, or could be of upholstered design" (as described in page 2, lines 6-9). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the mattress assembly of Propst '952 with a mattress foundation comprising at least on sidewall outer surface and at least one ground support member each having a pattern in order to impart a finished appearance to the assembly as desired.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles '729 in view of Poole '198, and further in view of Saputo '946. Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198, does not specifically disclose the use of a headboard tangentially extending vertically along one end of the foundation. Saputo '946 provides the basic teaching of a plastic mattress

Art Unit: 3673

foundation (10) provided with brackets (59, 60) for securing a headboard thereto. The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the mattress foundation of Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198, with a headboard tangentially extending vertically along one end of the foundation in order to impart a more finished appearance thereto.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles '729 in view of Poole '198 and further in view of Saputo '946 as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Bellows et al. '191. Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198 and as further modified by Saputo '946, does not specifically disclose a condition wherein the headboard is constructed substantially of plastic material. Bellows et al. '191 provide the basic teaching of a plastic bed frame (10) including a headboard (16) and constructed from a plastic material (see Bellows et al. '191, column 3, lines 37-39). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the mattress foundation of Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198 and as further modified by Saputo '946, with a headboard constructed substantially of plastic material since such a headboard is generally well known as being economical and lightweight as taught by Bellows et al. '191, thereby also facilitating attachment to a mattress foundation.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles '729 in view of Poole '198 and further in view of Saputo '946 and Bellows et al. '191 as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Wallace et al. '537. Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198 and as further modified by Saputo '946 and Bellows et al. '191, does not specifically disclose a

Art Unit: 3673

condition wherein an outer surface of the headboard includes a pattern. Wallace et al. '537 provide the basic teaching of a headboard (12) provided with a pattern (21) on its outer surface (18). The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the mattress foundation of Broyles '729, as modified by Poole '198 and as further modified by Saputo '946 and Bellows et al. '191, with a headboard having an outer surface including a pattern in order to "enhance the attractiveness and beauty of the structure" as desired (see Wallace et al. '537, column 1, lines 3-9).

Conclusion


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gaboury et al. '397, Gaboury et al. '761, Paul '677, Paul '377, Lenner '071, Lupo '259, Santo '375, Fitzgerald et al. '106, Hall '356, Tambascio '725, Fridolph '506, Wilkie '319 and Rogers '630.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert G. Santos whose telephone number is (703) 308-7469. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fr and first Mondays, 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3673

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Robert G. Santos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3673

R.S.
December 26, 2004